

**Mecklenburg County
Juvenile Crime Prevention Council Regular Meeting
January 16th, 2020**

Members Present: Janelle Fleck, Ashley Murrell, Sonya Harper, Kendra King, Kevin Poirier, Leigh Altman, Jessica Davis, Russell Price, Jason Tryon, Heather Taraska, Wanda Douglas, Lt. Gene Lim, Commissioner Pat Cotham, Brittney Bogues, David Strickland

Staff Present: Scott Stoker, Elizabeth Swann

Guests Present: Shavonda McClure-Tresports, Cara Evans-Patterson-CMPD Youth Diversion, Glenn Smith-Life Connections-DASH, Becky Smith-Thompson Child & Family Focus, Jonelle Giulianelli-DASH, Tiffany Bridges- Thompson Child & Family Focus, Alvick Ward-People Change, Joe Mynatt-Guest, Michael Jackson- Elite Focus Inc, Robin Sturdivant-Team Up Connections, Shannon Chambers-TYM-SHIFT, Robert Reynolds-Tresports, Michael Clark- Child & Family Services, Ravon Barnes-Child & Family Services, Lt LeBraun Evans-CMPD, Amber Wathington-CMPD Youth Diversion, Sonya Black-NCDPS-DJJ, Michelle Duprey-CFCR-COT, Antwon Williams-NCDPS-DJJ

Members Absent: Tysha Shaw, Dr. Cotrane Penn, Scott Littlejohn, Denise Steele-Campbell, Dr. Keith Cradle,

The meeting was called to order at 4:39 p.m. by the Chair Kevin Poirier. Quorum was established.

Review and Approval of January 16th 2020 Agenda:

Kevin allowed council members to review the agenda. David Strickland moved to accept the agenda. Wanda Douglas seconded. The council unanimously approved the agenda.

Review and Approval of December 19th, 2019 Minutes: Kevin allowed council members to review the minutes. Kendra King moved to approve the minutes with the amendment to add Brittney Bogues to December 19th meeting minutes. Russell Price seconded. The council approved the minutes with the amendment.

Welcome

JCPC Chair Kevin Poirier facilitated introductions of JCPC Council members.

Announcements / Reminders

The attendance requirement is now 65% of all regularly scheduled committee meetings.

The inclusion of special and assigned subcommittee meetings is no longer applicable, its 65% of all regularly scheduled meetings. There are no excused absences. Members cannot miss three consecutive regularly scheduled committee meetings. To have action in the subcommittee meetings there must be a quorum to be able to vote.

April Meeting Date

The April meeting date falls within the Mecklenburg County School Spring break the decision is to move the meeting date to the date prior which is April 9th or the week after which is April 23rd. Discussions on the funding procedure to continue with presentations. If presentations are to continue it will be in March and April will be the decision making.

Judge Strickland made a motion to move the meeting to April 23rd. *Kendra King* seconded. One opposed. The motion carried, the council approved the motion to move the JCPC meeting to April 23rd.

Budget Revision for JCPC Admin

The parking line item is in the deficit by \$219.25, the proposed is to move \$600.00 from food budget to satisfy the negative balance \$219.25, with a remaining balance of \$375.00 for parking for the fiscal year. The previous balance for food is \$1380.00 and going forward the food budget will be \$780.00. *Leigh Altman* moved to approve the JCPC Admin Budget revision. Jason Tryon seconded. The JCPC council approved the motion to transfer funds from the food line item to satisfy the parking line item for the remainder of the fiscal year.

RFP FY21

Risk and Needs Committee met a month ago. Kevin had the RFP on the screen for viewing. The RFP 20-21 is for \$2,051.713, *Scott Stoker* provided an overview. Concerning the RTA (Raise the Age) to be able to work with any juvenile over the age of 17yrs if they are under court supervisor. Risk & Needs data information was added. Timeline of RFP posting is to have 2 informational sessions on Feb 3rd and Feb 5th which are mandatory for programs to attend that are applying. The language for the commercial sexual exploitation of children in the manner of sex trafficking was added to the previous RFP for the expansion funds in October, which was left in.

These JCPC program types in yellow were not advertised in last fiscal year RFP: They are adding Substance Abuse Assessment /Treatment; Individual Group and Family Counseling ; Mediation /Conflict Resolution ; Experiential Skill Building; Tutoring / Academic Enhancement; Sex Offender treatment is also new for this year; the list must be voted on and can be edited.

Documentation of one month's worth of expenses is required in the RFP that is explained in detailed due to a county guideline, JCPC council and the Mecklenburg County would have to approve before it's place on the website.

- Letter should be on agency letter head
- Include the amount of the one month's operating expense
- Notarized and signed by the appropriate person
- Attach to the letter a balance sheet, bank statement, or letter from bank regarding your line of credit

Part of RFP language is part of the application to aid the programs for submission of their applications. Funding meeting will be in April, information regarding SPEP guidelines to be more comprehensible for programs.

Risk & Needs Committee Chair- Kendra King

Kendra explained the conception was to expand on the previous RFP solicitation, the more options due to Raise the Age would mean the more successful to adapt back into society. The 16 & 17yrs are adult high schoolers, we should provide more tangible things to broaden their skills.

Discussions:

Kevin advised if there are any changes to make now would be an opportune time. Decisions would have to be made on the timeline for posting of the RFP, if approved the posting would be Tuesday, Jan 21st which requires posting for 30 days minimum. The council can decide if the applications are due on Friday, Feb 21st or the council can decide to give the programs 45 days which would provide more time for advertisement and reaching different networks.

Commissioner Cotham inquired about the advertisement of the RFP, Kevin explained the RFP is posted on the county website with the assistance from the County's Public Information department, social media posts that include Twitter & Facebook, current JCPC mailing list of past & previous programs & guests, the county's homepage which links to the press releases. *Jason Tryon*, JCPC Marketing Committee utilizes the county's PI to broadcast to news media groups.

For the calendar guideline if the RFP post longer than 30 days the applications would be due on March 6th which would be 14 extra days. This will also depend on what is being done with the funding procedure and if presentations will be presented. If there were presentations it will be on the 19th, from the 6th to the 19th the challenge would be whether the Funding Committee would have time to score the applications. *Commissioner Cotham* inquired if it was essential for the RFP to be due on Friday as opposed to a Monday? *Jessica Davis* informed that programs are required to submit a physical copy of their request, so we need to keep in mind that whatever time and day is designated someone is available to receive the hardcopies. Criminal Justice Services is the recipient of the hardcopies which in the past has been sent in at 3:00pm and has been left open until 5:00pm.

Discussions ensued regarding providing County PI dept enough time to post the RFP via the different social media outlets due to the MLK holiday. Meeting spaces must be reserved in advance. *Scott Stoker*, JCPC Area Consultant's schedule has to be taken into consideration since he instructs the mandatory informational sessions.

Activity	Date
Posting of RFP on Mecklenburg County website	Friday January 24, 2020
Mandatory Pre-Bid Information Session (see checklist for times and location)	Monday, February 3 rd , 2020 2PM-4PM Wednesday, February 12, 2020 10AM-12PM
RFP Submission Deadline	Monday, March 2, 2020 at 5PM
JCPC Reviews of Submissions	Thursday, March 19, 2020
JCPC Selection of RFP Awards	Thursday, April 23 rd , 2020

Lt Gene Lim moved to accept the RFP FY 20-21 process timeline changes. *Jessica Davis* seconded. Kevin requested raise of hands for voting. The council approved the RFP 20-21 process timeline.

Yes	13
No	0
Abstain	0

Funding Procedure Document

Kevin explained this document was used for the expansion fund RFP and would like JCPC council to review and approve if going forward this will be the one to utilize for the RFP 20-21. A summary of potential changes revolves to have presentations at the March meeting and to either keep the minimum score of 11 out of 15, remove minimum score altogether or lower the score to 9 out of 15 for example. There were concerns from the December meeting minutes on not considering programs because the minimum score of 11 was not met and we ended up with excess funds which we could have considered programs that didn't quite meet the score who were close. The decision is also in the hands of the JCPC chair as how to do the presentations, Kevin's suggestion would be a 5 minute presentation with 5 minutes for questions.

Discussions:

Leigh Altman asked what is the basic criteria that we are deciding whether to rely upon minimum scores, since we don't want to penalize certain programs due to inexperience in certain fields but have an efficient program. *Leigh* said she would be in favor of presentations, since you can assess someone's ability to speak about something they believe in, their ability to defend their program and their commitment.

Kevin explained the Scoring Tool For 2020-21 Funding

County Disqualifiers (Application will be excluded from consideration if not included)

- Conflict of Interest Form
- No Over Due Tax Form
- Proof of 501(c)(3) Status
- Proof of One Month Operating Expenses

The review of the funding applications includes

- Community Need and Organizational Capacity
- Program Outcomes/Evaluation
- Program Financials

Scores are recommended for consideration of funding to the JCPC 1: Not Recommended; 2; 3: Possible Recommendation; 4; 5: Recommended

Judge Strickland asked over the last 2-3 years how many programs are eliminated by not meeting the minimum score, *Scott* stated on the average its between 4-5 out of roughly 22 applicants .

Judge Strickland says he personally doesn't have a strong opinion of doing presentations or not doing presentations. It would be up to each individual member to spend the time to read the RFP to provide an intelligent conclusion.

Lt Gene Lim asked for clarifications on not doing presentations, Kevin explained it would be similar to expansions fund process, the Funding Committee would meet and score the applications, the RFP would be sent out for council members to review and the next meeting the council would have the score sheet of the Funding Committee along with the RFP and have conversations on the funding based on the RFP applications without the presentation. Kevin conveyed this year because the number of programs that were eligible will be consider for funding, the amount of money was greater than the amount of money requested by the eligible programs it became obvious the move was to grant everyone their full funding, it might not happen like that every time and there would be rigorous discussions around how much to fund each program.

Kevin stated concerning the calendar with the RFP that was just approved for the March meeting date, there would be hypothetically program presentations and if there were not presentations, we would have the March meeting to potentially discuss funding. The RFP was set for the awards to be at the April meeting. *Judge Strickland* asks has the JCPC council always done presentations ? *Sonya Harper* expressed the JCPC council has historically done RFP presentations. There have been instances where certain programs were allocated more time to present on their programs, the questioning at times have been a bit adversarial , not all members of the council have taken the time to review the RFP, which is potentially why the presentation have become so long, is that it presents the opportunity of the council to learn about the program for the first time. *Sonya* stated regardless of the decisions we need to have an equitable process. The process that we have had with the presentations in the past provided all programs an equal and fair opportunity and the new programs that are first time applicants have been the ones that struggle thru that process.

Kevin asked the council to have some discussion on the scoring rate, should it be changed or removed ? Kevin had conversation with the Wake County JCPC Chair, they have presentations, they don't have a scoring tool and there is no elimination process. They have a Funding Committee that makes recommends to the full JCPC council.

Kevin was disappointed about the last meeting where programs were eliminated when we had the excess funding, he likes the idea of stricter presentations and questions, a lot of the council members will benefit from seeing some of the work that the programs do. The new council members haven't been thru the process of program presentations and we ought to consider reducing the 11 out of 15 score so that we don't find ourselves in a situation excluding a program when they receive a 9 due to being a first-time program and yet we end up with the extra funds like last time. That seems to be problematic and if we end up with numerous applications and we have to make decisions during the meeting we can use the funding committee 's scoring sheet to determine and prioritize the choices.

Judge Strickland mentioned that public speaking maybe difficult for new programs presenting vs the past programs that have been funded and know what to expect. If we put 5 minute limit on the new programs they maybe talented but might not sound the part, which is another reason for potentially not doing the presentations for one year and see how it goes.

Jessica Davis's argument is that you will have some programs that have strong writers and present very well on paper and not in a person presentation or have programs with strong presentations, but their RFP scored 9 or 10.

Logistics of the presentation ?

- 9 and above would be possible recommendations based on scoring
- Structured questions based off the RFP
- The questions asked will determine how long it takes the program to answer, doesn't agree with the 5 min limits
- Submitted questions before the presentation for the programs to answer
- Questions need to be specific per program
- Different questions for currently funded programs vs new programs

The questions can be decided without modifying the funding procedure. The motion from *Commissioner Cotham* is to approve the JCPC funding procedure for FY20-21 with the modify changes of a minimum score of 9 out of 15. *Ashley Murrell* seconded. Kevin requested raise of hands for voting. The motion passed.

The Funding Committee will make a recommendation to the JCPC as to which programs have attained the minimum score. Programs that meet the minimum score will be considered for funding and invited to present to the full JCPC council.

Yes	Opposed	Abstain
8	4	0

Kendra inquired when the Funding Committee will meet to review the RFP? Meeting will be in March after the RFP deadline closes. Kevin stated there will be a February meeting to review the monitoring report and the March meeting will be listening to the presentations and April meeting will be voting. Before the presentation the Funding Committee will send out the RFP scoring results for review which the council will have in hand before the presentations. Kevin stated at the February meeting we can form questions to ask.

Sonya stated to keep in mind that there is a significant number of service gaps, so there are a variety of types of programs that we need and are currently not funding. In addition, we have \$2M to disperse this year, we need to be cognoscente about funding programs to fill the service gaps and to be able to serve a greater number of kids. In relation to Wake County their allocation is very similar to what Mecklenburg County received last year, Wake County served over 1,500 kids and Mecklenburg County on a good year served roughly 800 kids, with \$2M we should be able to serve roughly 2000 kids in Mecklenburg County. We must be cognoscente about the type of programs we are funding, the amount of funding that we are providing, and the number of kids that we can serve. There is a significant number of gaps of programs we are not serving, we don't have sex offender, vocational, substance abuse and gang programming to name a few. *Sonya* conveyed something for the council to consider that each year we should make a commitment that a certain percentage of our funding are geared towards new programs.

Allocate Remaining Expansion Funds

Kevin displayed an excel spreadsheet of the (4) programs which submitted a budget narrative for the funding they want to receive. The total funding available is \$188,284, of that \$50,000 required a match and the \$138,000 didn't. If the programs were funded at the requested total amount, we would still have \$68,947, but \$50,000 of that is hypothetical money from Thompson that requires the 30% match. We can hold the \$50,000 funding until 3rd Quarter accounting and then come back to programs to see if there is a need for the additional \$50,000. The remaining amount of expansion funds is \$18,947.55.

Discussions:

Tresports requested funding for a vehicle, but additional youth served is zero ? Will this allow you to expand in any capacity? The funds will require a 30% match because it's a capital overlay.

- With Raise The Age we anticipate that we will be servicing more schools which will require another vehicle.

DASH-Mentoring what is your cost per youth and you're asking for \$31,000 to serve (5) kids which puts your cost per child at \$6,300, the cost seems extremely high? Have you received any referrals for older kids as yet ?

- With the new vocational and GED component , it was added to the mentoring program with the initial funds, we got \$80,000 for (10) kids which is \$8,000 a child. This additional money we can do (5) more kids to put in vocational programs, mentoring ship, we are also paying stipends. The funding will enable the youths to get internships This is dedicated to the Raise the Age youths who will not be attending traditional schools, this is a vocational component. We are getting approved to be a GED site. Meeting has been set up with the court counselors to obtain referrals for the older kids.

Lt Gene Lim makes a motion to fund the programs at the fully requested amount. *Kendra King* seconded. Kevin requested raise of hands for voting. The motion passed.

Yes	Opposed	Abstain
11	0	0

The remaining amount of expansion funds is \$18,947.00 which can stay unallocated until April 14th or it has to be removed to go back to the state. We have \$50,000 from Thompson if no other programs will require it, it will go back to the state during 3rd Quarter accounting in March. Scott's recommendation is to table it for now and address it at the February meeting.

Kevin thanked the council for taking the time to approve the RFP and funding procedures and being committed to the process.

Committee Reports:

State	Monitoring report due
County	Monitoring visits
Marketing Committee	N/A
Monitoring Committee	N/A
Risk &Needs Committee	N/A
Funding Committee	Funding Committee meetings TBD for 3/9, 3/11, 3/12
Bi-Laws Committee	N/A
Nominating Committee	N/A
Program Support	March 6 th , Racial Equity Training at Valerie Woodard 9am-12pm
Executive Committee	N/A

Jessica Davis made a motion to adjourn. Janelle Fleck seconded. Meeting was adjourned at 6:12pm.

Minutes submitted by Elizabeth Swann